

what happens. Then we embrace it, and that program never goes away. It just gets bigger. No little pilot programs try something and then get out of the way. When did the government ever start something and not make it bigger?

We are sitting here with \$32 trillion of debt, and all we are doing is talking about how much money we are going to spend.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: Why don't you increase taxes? I tell you what, why don't we have that debate? You can't tax enough to spend all the money we are spending. You literally can't. Run the numbers. Put up a spreadsheet. If we ever actually debated and came down here and had a serious conversation, we could have that debate. I would love to have that debate, but we just keep writing checks we can't cash.

□ 1600

What else are we doing? Authorizing and extending security support to Ukraine at \$800 million without inspector general oversight.

Amendments were offered in the Foreign Affairs Committee just the other day, saying: Well, shouldn't we have more oversight with Ukraine money?

Democratic colleagues said: Well, we are for oversight, but not right now. Why in the hell would we want to have oversight right now over the money we are now spending in Ukraine and how it is being used?

No, let's just figure it out later because then what will we do? Nothing. We will do the same thing we always do: Spend more money that we don't have.

Not one Member of this body can come down here and refute that because every Member of this body knows it is true.

I will throw that out there, a challenge. I would love any Member of this body, any of my 434 colleagues, to come on down. Let's debate the proposition that we are going to do anything other than spend more money that we don't have.

I will wait for the takers because the fact is it is true, and it is both sides of the aisle.

Here is what will happen: Next year, Republicans will be in control. Next year, there will be all sorts of debate about appropriations bills. We will go through all the motions. Maybe we will pass some really good appropriations bill that holds spending in check to inflation or frozen at 2022 levels or whatever. Come up with something, anything that any normal budget, family, business would do.

Our guys will come down and do all that, be all proud, pat ourselves on the back, "Oh, yes, look at us. We just passed something that is fiscally responsible." Even if it is not, we will say it is.

Then what? We will barrel forward. The Senate won't accept it. Sometime in August or September, right before a

big government shutdown threat, Senators will say, "We are not taking that."

A whole bunch of people will say, "Oh, no. Defense, they need their appropriations." A whole bunch of people will say, "We need nondefense discretionary."

Hey, I have an idea, why don't we just spend it all? Let's just do that. Let's just say, yes, we will get a 10 percent increase for nondefense discretionary and a 10 percent increase for defense, and we will just call it a day and say, "Well done us." We just spent our children's inheritance so we can go give a speech saying how we helped our military; we wrote a whole bunch more checks for a whole bunch more government bureaucrats and agencies because we have more grants and more programs to promise you more stuff at the United States house of free stuff. We are just going to dole that out without regard to any responsibility whatsoever.

Not one Member of this body can refute what I just said other than the maybe hyperbolic examples, although I don't know that they are that hyperbolic. I will wait and see next September where we are on the numbers.

"Inflation is high. Don't you understand, CHIP? So why don't we just spend at inflation levels?" Oh, good. Let's just increase the entire budget of the United States by 8, 9, 10 percent when we are \$32 trillion in debt and when mandatory spending is on autopilot to continue to blow through the roof.

What about those interest rate payments? Those have gotten a little crazy, huh? Sitting here with now 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 percent interest. We didn't see that one coming, did we? Except that we did, but we didn't care because both sides will retreat to their postures, and then they will just kind of throw their hands up and say: "CHIP, it just is what it is. Biden is President. You need 60 in the Senate. We have a thin majority, so, man, what are we going to do?" And here we sit.

I will give this speech again in January, and I will give it again in March, and I will give it again in May, and then we will be here in September, and I hope someone can prove me wrong, but I will take the bet. There will either be a CR because we can't come to an agreement, which means we are spending at this year's levels, which is I guess somewhat fiscally better, but bad for defense and bad for how you do things, or there will be a massive bunch of spending. That is it. Those are your choices.

There will not be a reasonable sit-down to do the job that we are supposed to do.

I believe I am going to get in trouble, but I need to go do a radio interview, so I am going to have to walk off the floor now.

Here is the thing: I am just asking any one of the Members of either side of the aisle to say we are going to stop

doing that. At some point, we are going to stop doing that, stop spending money we don't have, stop cooking all these bills up in back rooms and dropping them on the floor like happened just today with a 4,400-page, \$860 billion National Defense Authorization Act, airdropped onto the floor, take it or leave it.

So, I left it, and I had to vote against defense, which is not exactly where I want to be, but I am sure as heck not going to continue to go down this road and look at my kids and grandkids one day and say: Well, too bad. Your country is bankrupt.

I hope my colleagues will wake up tomorrow and say they want to avoid having to say the same thing to their kids or grandkids.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8404. An act to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023, SUBMITTED BY MR. SCHIFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The following is the Explanatory Statement (the "Explanatory Statement") to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 ("the Act"), which has been included as Division F of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023. The Explanatory Statement reflects the result of negotiations between the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (together, "the Committees"). The Explanatory Statement shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of the Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a conference committee.

The classified nature of U.S. intelligence activities prevents the Committees from publicly disclosing many details concerning their final decisions regarding funding levels and policy direction. Therefore, the Committees have prepared a classified annex—referred to here and within the annex itself as "the Agreement"—that contains a classified Schedule of Authorizations and that describes in detail the scope and intent of the Committees' actions.

The Agreement authorizes the Intelligence Community (IC) to obligate and expend funds as requested in the President's budget and as modified by the classified Schedule of Authorizations, subject to applicable reprogramming procedures.

The classified Schedule of Authorizations is incorporated into the Act pursuant to Section 6102 of the Act. It has the status of law. The Agreement supplements and adds detail to clarify the authorization levels found in the Act and in the classified Schedule of Authorizations.

This Explanatory Statement incorporates by reference, and the Executive Branch shall